CP, SWP Debate Election Policy

See Page 2

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XXIII — No. 40 | 222 | NEW YORK, N.Y., MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1959 | Price 10c

"Armistice" in Cold War Follows Khrushchev Trip

AFL-CIO Tops Sweep Issues Under the Rug

By Art Sharon

SAN FRANCISCO, Sept. 26—If there is one thing that the third annual convention of the AFL-CIO established in its sessions here, it is that the American union movement is afflicted with an acute crisis of leadership.

Meeting in the midst of a savage government - employer, anti-labor offensive the leaders of labor, potentially the most powerful social force in the country, proved utterly incapable of charting a course of action that held forth any promise of turning the tide of reaction.

Consider the setting of the convention:

Approximately 500,000 steel workers in the third month of their strike with the threat of a Taft-Hartley injunction held over them.

The enactment of the union-busting Landrum - Griffin-Kennedy bill on the very eve of the convention.

The stormy movement of the Negro people pressing forward in determined struggle to win their rights and looking to the union movement as their natural ally in this fight.

The AFL-CIO, four years after the unity convention, still riven by fratricidal jurisdictional strife reminiscent of the craft-union era.

If ever a convention met in times of profound challenge to program, policy and leadership, this was it. Sad to relate, the third constitutional convention of the united AFL-CIO wound up this week with the labor movement's major problems no closer to solution than they were a week before.

There was no proposal for effective action to ward off the Taft-Hartley threat to the steel strikers.

The political policy which had led the labor movement into a dead-end was largely reaffirmed.

Instead of championing the cause of Negro equality and cementing an alliance against the anti-labor, jim-crow Dixiecrats, the union tops condoned and defended jim-crow practices in unions affiliated to the federation.

Only in the field of jurisdictional conflict did the convention take some timid steps toward seeking some way of curbing the craft-conscious marauders who have progressed little since the days of Gompers.



A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

To the eye this was a meeting of the heads of the labor movement; in reality it was more like John L. Lewis' description of a similar meeting—a gathering of its rump.

Several times during the convention delegates tried to strengthen the implementation of official AFL-CIO policy. Each time they were either shunted off with a motion of referral or were forcibly reminded by President Meany that the AFL-CIO was a federation — that its resolutions only had moral effect.

This gave even the "good" resolutions an insubstantial air. Powerful international unions could vote for them and then ignore them or violate them as they chose. The slim reed of hope held out to those who protested was the promise of intercession by the good offices of Meany.

(Continued on Page 4)

Joan Jordan Urges End to Bomb Tests

SAN FRANCISCO — In appearances at various local union bodies, Joan Jordan, Socialist Worker candidate for mayor, has called for an end to nuclear bomb tests and the arms race. She has also spoken for a 30-hour week at 40 hours pay, for slum clearance to provide 30,000 new homes in San Francisco for low-income families, and extension of child-care centers.

She urges labor to throw its weight on these key issues by breaking with the two parties of big business and organizing a labor party.

At a Brewery Workers meeting she assailed the Pacific Gas and Electric Company's monopoly of power as a violation of the City Charter.

"San Francisco's power is generated at publicly owned dams," she said. "It is then sold to PG & E which resells it at profitable prices to the consumer. This is in direct violation of the City Charter and the Federal Raker Act passed before World War I. These laws provide that publicly generated power be sold directly to the consumer through municipally owned distributing systems.

"I propose we end this illegal monopoly in San Francisco by setting up the municipal system called for by the City Charter."

At a "Candidates Night" sponsored by the Lafayette Club, Joan Jordan appeared with two other working-class candidates for public office.

Jean Steiner, Socialist Labor candidate for mayor, called for socialism but rejected the present trade unions and all immediate or partial demands, including organization of a labor party, that could help mobilize workers for the struggle for socialism.

Archie Brown, a longshoreman running for supervisor on a platform of "immediate issues," including a demand for working-class representation in government, said that he merely wants to put pressure on the winning politician to carry out the people's will.

Joan Jordan held that the Socialist Labor candidate was sectarian in rejecting partial moves toward socialism, while Archie Brown was inconsistent in calling for workers' representation in government but not urging formation of a labor party.

Iowa Hospitality on Display



Soviet Premier Khrushchev (behind microphones, foreground) stands under a welcome sign as he makes a speech outside the Fort Des Moines Hotel Sept. 22. An estimated 5,000 persons were on hand to greet him. The American people in the majority indicated interest in the head of the Soviet government and hope that his visit might help relax world tensions. No sympathy was displayed anywhere for demonstrators who sought to arouse bellicose expressions against the visiting dignitary.

But Wall Street Circles Predict Little Change In Bitter Basic Struggle

By Joseph Hansen

What was achieved by the "face to face" private talks between Eisenhower and Khrushchev? The consensus seems to be "a limited armistice in the cold war." The most evident result is the relaxation of international tensions which was desired by both Washington and Moscow, each for its own reasons.

Eisenhower said that Khrushchev had agreed to lift the ultimatum on Berlin. Khrushchev got a promise of further talks, including, very likely, a "summit conference."

Each side was thus able to report success in gaining "time." By postponing his visit to the Soviet Union until next spring, Eisenhower gained extension of the peace issue into the 1960 presidential campaign, a decided domestic advantage for the Republicans in exploiting against the Democrats the initiative taken by Nixon and Eisenhower in opening the talks with the Kremlin.

The "limited armistice" reflects a shift in the balance of world power toward the Soviet side. C. L. Sulzberger, foreign expert of the New York Times, expressed it this way Sept. 30: "The exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower was made desirable by establishment of a true balance of terror. Five years ago it was still conceivable, in the event of open conflict, that Russia could have been totally destroyed without being able to totally destroy the United States. This is no longer imaginable."

Sulzberger continues: "By its remarkable breakthrough in manufacture of missiles and hydrogen explosives the USSR ended the kind of preventive-war theory once entertained by certain . . . important Americans. That sort of reasoning is no longer just immoral; it is also deprived of logic."

Nevertheless, this student of power politics believes, no genuine peace is in sight. The bleak, bitter struggle will continue, although the name of the cold war may well be changed. "Once we can adjust to the idea that existing rivalry will endure for a long time and that it may indeed be the only kind of peace we know . . . we can start calling the cold war 'peace.' This could be the eventual outcome of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower talks."

Much more than this is in-

(Continued on Page 3)

Mich. SWP Files for 1960 Ballot Place

DETROIT, Sept. 28 — The Socialist Workers Party today filed 22,047 nominating petitions with the secretary of state in Lansing for a place on the ballot in the 1960 elections.

This was approximately 10,000 more petitions than are legally required for minor parties in Michigan. To guard against legal shenanigans of the kind used to bar the SWP from the ballot in 1956, however, it plans to file additional signatures in the coming month.

In a statement to the press issued at the time of filing, the SWP said:

"We hope a strong socialist vote in Michigan will be stimulated by the obvious political bankruptcy of the two capitalist parties. They are becoming more alike every day, as shown by the fact that they both cooperated in Lansing to pass the 4% sales tax and in Washington to pass the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin anti-union law.

"The bankruptcy of the liberals is symbolized by Gov. Williams, who inside of a single month signed the new sales tax law, endorsed the new anti-union law and sent state troopers to help the strikebreakers at the Cross plant in Fraser.

"Our campaign will concentrate on showing the need for workers to break with both old parties, form a labor party and run candidates seeking to kick out the profiteers and set up a workers and farmers government."

AGAINST MENTAL HEALTH

R. M. Shelton, Alabama KKK leader, opposed state mental health legislation, arguing that by electric shock treatment psychiatrists in six months could "make an integrationist out of a segregationist." He denounced the Alabama University Medical School for having " those alien psychiatrists . . . who talk in broken English with an alien accent."

Wide Sentiment for Committee To Fight Detroit Cop Brutality

By Evelyn Sell

An eyewitness account of a typical case of police brutality in Detroit has aroused such wide sympathy for the victim and such indignation over the assault that sentiment is high for the formation of a permanent citizens committee to keep the police department under surveillance.

John Conyers, attorney of the Negro teenage victim, announced that a continuing committee to abolish police brutality is being set up. "And this committee," he said, "will not just issue fine statements, but will be a real working body, with medical members to examine victims of such brutality, and legal counsel for the abused citizen."

Harold Norris, chairman of the local American Civil Liberties Union, which is aiding in the legal defense in the case, published an open letter to Mayor Miriani calling for the creation of "a permanent independent representative citizens' committee to investigate and make findings regarding complaints of police brutality; and . . . a declaration by the commissioner of police to the Police Department that the job of the police is to apprehend those participating in criminal acts and it is not to punish."

The case that has shocked the city began like any of the others that occur almost daily in the nation's auto capital. On Sept. 10 at 16th and Magnolia some police saw a group of teenagers sitting in a car which belongs to the mother of one.

Not liking their looks, the cops ordered them out of the car and started to search and arrest them. When one of them tried to get away, the cops got rough and — to their surprise — they got as good as they gave. Four of the police were hospitalized.

John W. Coury, assistant prosecutor, tried to exaggerate the situation when he said "there might have been a couple of dead officers" if several other scout cars hadn't arrived. "A large crowd had gathered and was hurling insults at the officers and offering no help against the youths who were fighting with them."

After more scout cars came and arrested the youngsters, they were taken to Vernor Station. In the police garage, Thaddeus Steel, 16, accused of hitting one of the cops with a chair, was dragged out of a scout car by his neck.

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT

A reporter and a photographer from the Detroit Free Press happened to be present. They described what happened next:

"Another patrolman raced up. 'Is this him?' he shouted. Then he threw a fist into Steel's face. A second patrolman pushed that assailant aside and sank his fist into Steel's stomach. Steel fell to the garage floor, moaning . . ."

A policeman saw the two newspapermen watching from the garage door and shouted: "Lower that door!"

"But all were too busy slugging Steel, now prone on the floor. They dragged him to the side and the onlookers could see

(Continued on Page 4)

New York Socialists Discuss 1960 Policy

By Lillian Kiezel

The question of what socialists and independents should seek to do in the 1960 presidential election was considered at a consultative conference of the United Independent-Socialist Committee held at the Fraternal Clubhouse in New York Sept. 26-27. The conference, attended by 226 people, engaged in a lively discussion of the deep-going differences in the radical movement today over electoral policy.

The debate pivoted around three main positions that were presented by William Albertson, New York State Communist Party Executive Secretary; Murry Weiss, National Committee member of the Socialist Workers Party; and Dr. Annette T. Rubinstein, 1958 UI-SC candidate for Lieutenant Governor of New York.

Albertson spoke against a united socialist presidential campaign. He advocated, instead, the establishment of some kind of people's non-partisan league that would urge the labor movement to form a third party eventually.

For the present, socialists should seek to wield influence in the Democratic Party. "Given effective mass work by all progressive forces," he said, "the Democratic convention could be influenced as to its program and candidates, and it is possible to elect an administration, responsive in some respects at least to the needs of the people and the supreme necessity of easing world tensions, of guaranteeing peaceful coexistence."

Weiss, after indicating the unfavorable consequences of the policy of class collaboration such as had been proposed by Albertson, stressed three main reasons why socialists should act independently and oppose capitalist party candidates in 1960: (1) To fight for a labor party. (2) To fight the cold war. (3) To conduct a crusade for socialism. "The class struggle in America," he said, "is pivotal to the world struggle which will decide whether we have war or peace."

Dr. Rubinstein presented a third position favored by a good many independents. She stands firmly for a united socialist presidential ticket in 1960 but is willing to consider other possibilities should they arise. In her summary, Rubinstein corrected an impression created by some during the conference that only those on the UI-SC allegedly opposed to "peaceful coexistence" are for a united campaign.

"Bill Price, Muriel McAvoy, the youth representative, myself, Elinor Ferry have been the most intransigent . . . for a presidential campaign or nothing," she said. "And we all subscribe . . . to the term 'peaceful coexistence.' There is a real difference of opinion between those . . . and I respect their sincerity, who feel that a 1960 election campaign would either be impossible, or would not be fruitful, and those who feel that there should be such a campaign. But that does not in any way correspond to any division on any other political grounds."

Rubinstein refused to concede that there will be no united election campaign in 1960. However, she said, "If we can't, I must associate myself with Bill Price and vote for any socialist

(Continued on Page 2)

British Election Polls Hearten Labour Campaign

By George Lavan

The Conservative (Tory) Party in Great Britain is getting a bad case of the jitters as election day — Oct. 8 — draws closer. On Sept. 8 the Tories, thinking it was in the bag, called for a quickie general election. But now the public opinion polls show a shift of sentiment towards the Labour Party. What the British capitalists a few weeks ago thought would be a sure thing, they now admit will be close, and secretly they fear that the Labour Party may win.

The Tory cabinet picked this month as the most favorable for the elections for the following three reasons: (1) Relative prosperity exists after the fading of the 1957-58 recession and its heavy unemployment. (2) The Eisenhower - Khrushchev visits have filled the British people with hopes that the danger of World War III will now be averted by a deal at the summit; and Tory Prime Minister Macmillan claims the credit for having brought the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting about. (3) Under right-wing leadership, the Labour Party has watered down its program to the point where it evokes little enthusiasm from the working people.

SHIFT REGISTERED

Despite this favorable combination of circumstances for the Tories, public opinion polls in the past few weeks have registered a drop in their lead from 7% to 2%. What appears to be happening is that the deep class feeling of the British workers is beginning to manifest itself as election day approaches — not necessarily because of, and possibly in spite of, Labour's wishy-washy program.

Labour lost the 1955 election because 1½ to 2 million workers did not bother to go to the polls. If these workers can be persuaded to the polls this year, solely from class loyalty they will vote the Tories out.

Washington's timing (not the decision itself, but its timing) of the Khrushchev visit was calculated with an eye to both this year's British elections and next year's U.S. elections. Similarly, when Eisenhower went to the Geneva summit meeting in 1955, one of the reasons was to help the Tories win in the elections that year.

The extent of American big-business election aid to the Tories this time is seen not only in the almost simultaneous timing of the Khrushchev visit and the British elections but in Eisenhower's trip to Britain and electioneering appearance on TV with Prime Minister Macmillan. Though it took place a week before elections were officially announced, the British press immediately regarded it as the unofficial announcement and the "first broadcast of the campaign" (London Daily Mail).

The liberal Manchester Guardian Weekly (Sept. 10) noted: "Even an American observer who was in this country at the time [of the Eisenhower-Macmillan 'fireside chat'] remarked yesterday that the President had been made to look like Mr. Macmillan's campaign manager."

Tribune, left-wing labor newspaper ran the angry headline: "What Kind of People Do They Think We Are?" explaining in the story, "In this question 'they' means the publicity hucksters who presented the Mac and Ike Show on Monday evening. 'We' means the British people."

Indeed the Tories have borrowed the Madison Ave. advertising techniques used so successfully to "sell" Eisenhower to the American public. Even the "I Like Ike" slogan has been copied with "We Back Mac!"

American correspondents have remarked that in program there is less and less difference between the British parties. The existence of a powerful labor party, which has held office in the past and instituted major reforms, such as nationalization of key industries and the free medical care program, and which may at any election again come into office, has forced the Tories to adopt more and more liberal policies. Thus the Tory party in Britain is considerably to the left of the Democratic Party in the U.S.

But while the Tory Party has been forced to adopt a liberal, welfare-state disguise to remain in politics, the right-wing leadership of the Labour Party has not advanced more drastic demands but has become more timid. Instead of moving to the left, the Labour Party leaders have moved to the right, to compete, they claim, with the Tories for middle-of-the-road voters. This makes it easier on the Tories as far as granting more economic and social-welfare concessions to the masses is concerned and, at the same time cripples the Labour Party's militancy and lessens its appeal to the masses of the working people.

Lacking any great issues, the Labour Party campaigners are having to make do with smaller ones. Certainly the record of the Tories in office offers plenty to lambast. Under Macmillan rent-control was ended with the landlords gouging whopping sums out of tenants. A drive against labor by employers, assisted by the government, has been started and promises to turn into an all-out assault once big business is sure of its party having another term in office. Labour is demanding a modest increase in old-age pensions, while the Tories are proposing a picayune increase.

On the anti-war issue Labour seems to be floundering most. Its program was mainly a call for a summit meeting. But here the Tories have stolen Labour's thunder. They not only took up the shout for a summit meeting but Macmillan has apparently delivered on it. This leaves Labour only with the weak rejoinder of "We called for it first."

But where the Tories now parade Macmillan as the saviour of peace, the summit arranger, etc., Labour has a strong argument in pointing to the imperialist record of Macmillan and the Tories in the invasion of Suez three years ago, the brutal repressions in Crete, Kenya and now Nyasaland. Moreover, they point to the 1955 campaign of Anthony Eden, whom the Tory posters portrayed with the slogan "Working For Peace" on the basis of his mediation which allegedly averted failure at the Geneva summit meeting earlier that year.

It was this "man of peace" as Prime Minister, with Macmillan as one of his chief backers, who engaged in the bloody and disastrous invasion of Egypt.

A strike by some 2,000 truck drivers has become a last minute election issue. The walkout, over a wage claim, at an oxy-acetylene welding tank company is being attacked by the Tories. The right-wing Labor leadership has taken the defensive, deploring the strike and labelling it unofficial.

BOOKS

History Is Running Against Them

WHAT'S WRONG WITH U.S. FOREIGN POLICY, by C. L. Sulzberger. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York. 1959. 255 pp. $4.50.

The New York Times plays a unique part in interpreting and molding official opinion on national and international political issues. It is regarded by many as a "third power" which mediates between the ruling interests of the country and the people in office at Washington.

The author of this book has been for 20 years its chief foreign correspondent. In that capacity he has visited five continents and talked with hundreds of statesmen. He has also discussed foreign policy problems on confidential terms with such top government figures as Eisenhower, Dulles, Acheson, Stevenson and the like.

His views and conclusions on U.S. foreign policy,therefore, have a special importance. They have been, and will be, listened to by the shapers of government policies in the nation's capital and elsewhere.

Sulzberger is a loyal supporter of U.S. imperialism. Yet he feels impelled to make a severe indictment of Washington's foreign policy in the postwar period. For all its achievements, in his opinion, the Truman-Eisenhower line has been ineffective.

"In 1945, even after the pell-mell demobilization of our forces, the strategical position of the United States and its Western friends was good," he writes. "Today it can be described at best as poor. We and our allies have forfeited bastions one by one in the Middle East and Asia. The Arabs are in arms, for the most part against us. The Chinese mainland has slipped away. We lost our brief atomic preponderance, and Soviet Russia, after an amazingly fast recovery, has become a superpower in every sense."

Too Rigid, Too Inflexible

Washington's diplomacy has been too rigid and remains too inflexible, failing to take into account "this startling change in international balances." He calls upon the policy-makers to face the obvious weaknesses in their position and undertake a revision of foreign policy in the light of the changed conditions of world affairs.

"We have vacillated between false slogans of 'containment' and 'liberation' from Communism, achieving neither," he observes. "We have built up in friendly but unstable countries military machines their economies cannot support. We have sought to create **status quo** situations where none before existed and we have avoided their creation elsewhere even when such conditions were possible. In this unsatisfactory situation we survive in nuclear stalemate, an equilibrium of terror that cannot endure forever."

Sulzberger opposes moralizing and upholds "pondered realism" in pursuing foreign policy. The mainsprings of American interest are not ideological, moral or religious, he says. The chief objective of U.S. foreign policy is to contain the expansion of the Sino-Soviet bloc. He measures all the actions of U.S. diplomacy by the degree of their success in accomplishing this end.

This justifies aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Poland where they oppose the Kremlin's aggression, as he puts it; and negotiations with Moscow against Peking if the latter threatens to push outward in the Far East.

He is a strong adherent of NATO as the main deterrent of Soviet expansionism in Europe. But he admits that the Atlantic Alliance is slipping and "the situation may grow worse before it stands a chance of getting better." He proposes to strengthen NATO by converting it from a mere military coalition into a political alliance.

Sulzberger is a caustic critic of the propaganda pretensions and diplomatic sermonizing indulged in by U.S. statesmen. Such pronouncements irritate other nations and boomerang against us, he says. The United States is poorly placed to condemn colonialism and interference in other people's affairs or to stand forth as a paragon of democracy.

Smug criticism of "colonialism" is not only offensive to allied powers like England and France; "it might be considered bad taste in a nation that itself continues to control areas as distant as Okinawa."

"We interfered up to our elbows to assure a government in Greece upon which we could look with favor. We interfered in France, during the late nineteen forties, to succor a Third Force coalition and prevent Charles de Gaulle's first effort to return to power. During the 1948 Italian elections we grossly interfered; our ambassador toured Italy making speeches deliberately calculated to sway voters."

He might have added Washington's benevolence toward de Gaulle's assumption of power last year and Eisenhower's TV broadcast with Macmillan on his recent trip to England designed to help the Conservatives return to office.

The spectacle of American bigotry toward the Negroes alienates the colored races throughout the world and mocks our professions of democracy. While posing as guardians of democracy against dictatorship, "with no sense of embarrassment, we ally ourselves with Franco, Salazar, Batista, Field Marshal Sarit, and the slave-owning King Saud . . . We preach democracy to states which cannot apply it, and simultaneously we support dictators."

The result is that the influence of Communism is spreading, despite all the money and efforts the U.S. has expended. This is especially true in the Middle East. There "the U.S. has lost the initiative in its propaganda contest with the Soviet bloc." Soviet aid programs are more welcome than the American which are tied up with military and political commitments. The Soviet Union has acquired a foothold in the area which cannot be eliminated and hereafter has to be reckoned with.

All is "chaos and confusion" in Washington's Middle East actions. Dulles had no clear policy but operated on a day-to-day, place-to-place basis. The debacle of the Baghdad Pact strikingly illustrated the "pactomania" which pastes paper over problems instead of solving them, treaties which are torn to shreds by the first gusts of social struggle.

"The social and economic structure of the region is rotten and ripe for revolution," Sulzberger notes. These revolutions cannot be suppressed but they ought to be contained, he says. For this reason he condemns Dulles' heavy-handed flip-flops in dealing with Nasser and recommends coming to terms with Arab nationalism through the Egyptian leader.

Sulzberger believes that the U.S. is heavily overextended in its world-wide military commitments and cites some surprising figures on the magnitude of these involvements. "We are committed to defend no less than forty-five nations on five continents." For those inclined to regard the Democrats as less militaristic than the Republicans, he points out that 37 of these obligations were taken under a Democratic administration.

He also notes the tendency of the Executive to concentrate the war-making powers in itself. "From Truman's administration, there has been a steadily increasing tendency by an executive branch to involve us in a condition of war (as in Korea) or to risk involving us in such a condition (as in Lebanon) without prior legislative approval. Likewise, the precedent, without much comment or objection, can now virtually obligate the nation to treaty commitments such as the Baghdad Pact minus the formality of Senate ratification."

Sulzberger comes down hard on Eisenhower's Far Eastern policy. It is utterly unrealistic, he says, to pin hopes on Chiang or Syngman Rhee and turn one's back on Communist China. Chiang's hold upon Formosa and his own forces is weakening; Rhee is a jingoistic old man who dreams of provoking a new war to reconquer North Korea at American expense. He predicts that Okinawa may become the American Cyprus as its inhabitants rise up against U.S. Army occupation.

He attributes the stupidities of Washington's Far East policy to the influence of the Know-Nothing ultra-right wing of the Republican Party which exacted pledges from Eisenhower and Dulles before they were nominated in 1952 not to favor Peking's entry into the UN. This "Chiang Lobby" put in Walter Robertson as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Far Eastern Affairs to ensure that its line would be enforced.

Insults Taxi Drivers

Last week Robertson was chief U.S. spokesman against China's admission to the UN. His grasp of Far Eastern affairs can be gauged by a remark he made to Sulzberger at a Washington party in 1957: "Mao has no more real influence than the first taxi driver who goes by outside." Sulzberger comments: "To call such a statement meaningless is to flatter it."

Nevertheless, "much hard thinking is now going on in the U.S. over our unsuccessful China policy," he reports. Sulzberger favors the two-China position: maintain Chiang in Formosa but recognize Communist China and stop blocking its entry into the UN.

Sulzberger's candid and clear-sighted observations throw light on the administration's motives in connection with the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange visits. Weighty objective factors are behind the shift in Washington's attitude: the change in the balance of forces between the imperialist camp and the revolution; the decline in the power and prestige of the U.S.; the growing strength of the Sino-Soviet bloc; the nuclear deadlock. Apparently, cooler heads around the White House are having sober second thoughts on the need to reassess the international situation and readjust some of their policies.

Without saying so, Sulzberger provides much evidence that America's imperialists, who set forth to master the world in this century as Britain did in the last, have arrived too late to realize their aims. The forces of social revolution are upsetting their strategical plans; the tide of history is running against them. Whether or not they heed his advice, Sulzberger at least has warned the policy-makers in Washington to wake up from their dream world and change their course.

— **William F. Warde**

Subscribe!

To keep up with the real meaning of big events at home and abroad, you need the Militant. Try it for six months. Send your name and address and $1.

The Militant
116 University Pl.
New York 3, N.Y.

Enclosed is $1 for a six-months trial subscription.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone .....

State .....

Advertisement Advertisement

Three Years Of Regroupment

What is the balance sheet of three years of effort among independents and socialists to find a common program? Where do the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party stand? Is it still possible to do something together in the 1960 elections?

Read the opinion of the International Socialist Review, which has closely followed developments in this field since the beginning. In the fall issue. Send 35 cents for a copy.

International Socialist Review

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

Which Road for Socialists in 1960?

By Daniel Roberts

The two main, or "hard-rock," positions at the consultative conference of independents and socialists on political action (see story page one) were presented by William Albertson, executive secretary of the New York State Communist Party, and Murry Weiss, national committee member of the Socialist Workers Party.

"Essentially, there have been two points of view presented at the conference," said Albertson. One holds that there must be a socialist ticket in 1960 regardless of the fact "that there won't be a coalition" with other socialists and progressives. This point of view, he said, holds that the most important consideration for socialists is not their relations with the working class, the farmers, the Negro and Puerto Rican peoples, but that speaking about socialism over radio and TV is more important.

The other viewpoint, he said, holds that socialist agitation is not enough, that the most important task confronting the socialist movement is "to establish relations with the masses of workers and of the Negro people who are now in struggle." Many socialists are sitting on the sidelines, condemning these struggles as "opportunist," he charged.

IS IT PRATTLING?

In his opening presentation, Albertson had listed electoral struggles, both within the Democratic primaries in New York State and between the Democrats and Republicans in the general elections, as struggles whose outcome the mass of working people are concerned about. "The working people of town or country will not be broken away from the Democrats by prattling that the two parties are the same," Albertson said.

"It is not prattling to call the two major parties identical in their class essence," Weiss retorted. "I thought everybody knew that. Everybody here knows it or should know it. Even Khrushchev on the basis of a thirteen-day visit to this country said at least three times that the parties are identical." (In his summary, Albertson agreed that the Republicans and Democrats were alike in that both are capitalist parties.)

Weiss defined the central issue confronting socialists as follows: "The two hard-core positions in the debate are, one, the position of the Communist Party to shun independent socialist electoral efforts and to work within the two-party system, in cooperation with the labor officialdom, on the plea that this will lead to the eventual formation of a labor party. The other position, stressed by the Socialist Workers Party and others, is to oppose coalitions with capitalist politicians — to oppose any support of capitalist politicians — and for socialists to enter the elections independently."

Weiss cited the need to fight for a labor party, against the official policy of the labor leadership, as the first of three main reasons why socialists should conduct their own campaigns. The attempt to take a third position of "middle-ground maneuverability," or of "flexibility," between the two "hard-rock" positions, Weiss said in relation to John T. McManus' point of view, could not be sustained. It inevitably would lead to the adoption of either the CP's or the SWP's position.

The Albertson-Weiss debate also hinged on the function of socialist independent political action. A third party, said Albertson, "is not labor without a large part of the labor movement as part of it. It is not Negro, without the Negro people and some of their major struggle organizations as part of it. It is not farmer, without farmers . . . Of course, we left-wingers could get together and call ourselves a farmer-labor party. But we would be influencing only ourselves."

"We propose that socialists enter the 1960 elections in opposition to the capitalist parties. Do we propose to make believe that the socialists are thereby the labor party?" Weiss said in reply. "Do we propose to palm off a small, vanguard socialist force as the labor movement, the Negro people and the farmers, as is repeatedly insinuated and directly charged by the Communist Party in characterizing our proposal? No we did not. We said that socialists should enter elections and tell the truth . . . We should speak in this election not to make believe that we are **the** party of the people but to point the course toward building a mass party of labor."

Finally, Albertson and Weiss debated how the Khrushchev visit and the thaw in the cold war should be related to socialist electoral policy in 1960. Albertson held that the 1960 Democratic convention could be influenced to name candidates who would further peaceful coexistence, although he conceded that progressives would confront a "difficult problem" if the Democrats nominated a Johnson rather than a Stevenson. "Peaceful coexistence will be a major issue in the 1960 election," he added in his summary, "even without socialists raising the question."



MURRY WEISS

"We think the class-struggle road in politics is the way to fight for peace," said Weiss in his summary. "We think it's false to tell people that some Nixon or Stevenson, who mouths phrases on Mothers' Day that he is for international collaboration," should be painted up as a candidate for peace. All candidates in sight are for the cold war despite their present maneuvering on the question, because this represents "the interests of their class." "And that's why we must voice the interests of the majority of mankind against them in the 1960 elections," Weiss concluded.

Further arguments made by Albertson and Weiss in their original presentations follow:

By Albertson:

"There are four simple questions with which the American people are concerned now, today, and will be as the 1960 election rolls around."

Albertson defined these as (1) How to guarantee peaceful coexistence; (2) How to win the battle for Negro equality; (3) How to defeat the anti-labor laws and the anti-labor offensive; (4) How to win a measure of economic security against automation, speed-up and rising living costs.

"We here know that the fundamental solution to these problems as well as to all others which are products of the capitalist system, is the socialist reorganization of society. But unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of the American people do not accept this. They will learn the truth only as they struggle to improve their conditions . . .

"Do the workers, the Negro people, the Puerto Rican people care about the outcome of an election? Are they concerned with the immediate problems, and programs and issues? By and large they are. That is why, because of their concern, they often determine the outcome of an election, the victory or defeat of certain candidates. And if the masses are concerned with the outcome of an election, the Communists and socialists and other radicals must be concerned also . . .

"The majority of the workers as well as the labor movement still believe that they can win victories through the two-party system especially the Democratic Party. Shall we tell these workers and the trade unions that we will support them only if and when they have their own party or develop a socialist consciousness and until then we will go it alone in our isolated, sectarian purity?

"How can you win the working class for socialism if you refuse to unite with them and work with them for their desires and aspirations and their methods of achievement as they see them at the moment? . . .

"It is our firm conviction that a labor party, or some form of third party encompassing the Negro people, the farmers, and with labor playing the leading role, is a necessary stage in the development of class and socialist consciousness of our working class and in the struggle for socialism. That is our opinion. But it is not yet the opinion of the masses of workers and farmers and of the Negro people."

Such a party will be built only by "developing the struggles of these peoples for the things that the Democratic Party, as a supporter of capitalism, cannot and will not give them. Only when they find the doors of the Democratic Party closed to their demands will they turn in large numbers to a new party."

A few illusions in the Democratic Party "are being smashed on the rock of reality" and "we see signs of new stirrings amongst the workers."

"Our 1960 electoral policy may therefore be said to have these three objectives: (1) Help determine the outcome of the elections in a progressive direction — the strengthening of the fight for peaceful coexistence, Negro and labor's rights and security; (2) Raise the independent political action of labor, the Negro and Puerto Rican peoples to a higher level moving in the direction of a third party. (3) Spread the message of socialism through Communist Party candidates and build and strengthen the Communist Party . . .

"New York has a tradition of third party and fusion movements. There is a small but significant minority of workers and others who have already broken with the two-party system. The impact that they could make on the thinking of the majority for the need of a labor party is extremely important. That is why we see the need of some form of a people's non-partisan league, or a people's political action committee or a committee dedicated to winning the labor movement to the concept of a third party . . .

"The impact of the visit of Premier Nikita Khrushchev has been devastating to the warmongers . . . The possibility of peaceful coexistence between our country and the USSR is within our people's grasp. Let us unite to help guarantee this. Let us unite to help bring all our supporters into active participation in the mass electoral struggles as well as seek out the specific areas where united independent third peoples' candidacies will advance the struggle for a higher level of political independence, for a Farmer-Labor Party."

By Weiss:

"Now the Socialist Workers Party, as I said, proposes an independent campaign in 1960. For what reasons?

"First, to fight for a labor party. Because that leads into all other questions. Peace, defense of the labor movement, the struggle of the Negro people—all these questions are tied up fundamentally with the problem of class independence in politics. This requires formation of a labor party. That's the first reason why a socialist should go into this election. To point this out.

"It is not enough to say: Work among the people. This is the ABC of socialist politics. One must work among the people to show the road. Yes, there are many important indications that the Negro people, the workers and even sections of the labor bureaucracy are stirring. But the problem of problems is how the socialists can help prevent these promising indications from being bottled up within the two-party system once again.

"Isn't that a danger? Isn't that what we saw during the great militant upsurge of the 1930's when repeatedly sections of the workers sought the formation of a class party of their own? Didn't we see the labor bureaucracy beat back these moves time after time and stuff the workers back into the two-capitalist-party system? And to the disgrace of American radicalism, in our opinion, at the very moment when the radicals first attracted thousands of new militants and should have pitted themselves against the labor bureaucracy which was destroying the potentials of a labor party—at that very moment both the Communist Party and the Socialist Party became ardent supporters of keeping the independent movements within the framework of the capitalist parties.

"The second major reason why we should be in this election is to fight the cold war . . .

"American imperialism has been taking one beating after another. That was registered dramatically by the invitation for Khrushchev to come here. And then we saw the impact of that visit in shaking up the whole country and unfreezing some of those big issues that have been frozen in the terror of the cold war.

"And what should socialists do in this election campaign except to seize the opportunity to tell the truth about the issues — to stand guard so that there will be no return to the cold war; to point out every single instance of capitalism continuing to mount its war preparations?

"And aren't they preparing for war right now? At the very moment when they are retreating on the diplomatic-propaganda front, they have opened up on the international arena: Laos, the Indian border, Tibet, the new offensive in the United Nations against the People's Republic of China.

"And most important of all, what is the big business offensive against the labor movement in this country if not preparation for war? . . .

"Big business seeks to destroy the only force that can really undo their war preparations — the working class and its organizations . . .

"Finally, socialists should run in the elections—one is almost embarrassed to say this — to bring the message of socialism to the American people in terms that they are beginning to listen to. When man has reached out to the moon and put a sign on it, bearing the imprint of the USSR, the country that was first to overthrow capitalism and establish a workers state, isn't that an indication of what socialism will mean to humanity? Doesn't that open up possibilities to go to the American people and explain to them in concrete terms the superiority of a planned economy, of a system that overthrows capitalist property relations? . . .

"We can then show how much better, how much easier it could be done here in the United States. This country won't have to go through the isolation, the struggle against backwardness, the rise of a bureaucracy and the suppression of workers democray as in the USSR. We would have the advantage of taking the socialist road and inspiring the whole world to go socialist within a short time. This line of argument will also be the most effective antidote to the cold-war poison."

...New York Socialists

(Continued from Page 1)

candidate who is not anti-Soviet." She indicated that a candidate of the Socialist Workers Party would meet this qualification.

Promising to work for such a campaign if it is programmatically and practically feasible, she went on to compliment the SWP on its attitude as she had experienced it for the past year and a half in working on the committee and campaigning for socialism. "I do not subscribe to their whole program" and disagree with some of their statements and strategy "in terms of never supporting a capitalist candidate . . . Nevertheless I have been convinced that they can be depended on to work honestly and sincerely and within the limits of an agreement."

John T. McManus, 1958 Independent-Socialist candidate for Governor of New York, expressed another view. He does not believe that the radical parties are strong enough to run an independent campaign in 1960. He called for a "flexible program" which would not exclude support of a capitalist candidate if a suitable one should appear. He advocated close attention to developments in the labor movement pointing towards eventual independent political action.

Irving Beinin, whose views closely paralleled those of the Communist Party spokesman, opposed a socialist presidential ticket. He urged that the UI-SC provide the basis for a "left wing bloc" in New York City for the "large body of left wingers" who are unaffiliated with any party. This, he contended, would create a "political instrument capable of intervening on questions throughout the year and at all political levels."

Sam Pollock, Cleveland trade unionist who figured in the campaign to defeat the Ohio "right to work" law in 1958, addressed the conference. He pointed to encouraging indications of fresh thinking about the problem of a labor party among trade unionists nationally and urged the conference to do everything possible to advance a socialist campaign in 1960.

In the ensuing two-day floor discussion 44 people spoke. Of these, 26 favored a socialist presidential ticket and either supported the Rubinstein position or that of the SWP.

Opinions ranged all the way from that of a CP member who shouted that the SWP is suffering from "political schizophrenia always hollering, 'Go! Go! Go! Get on the ballot!'" to the declaration of Jean Rubinstein that "we should get on the ballot and stay on the ballot."

Young socialists, who ably articulated their feelings, had special impact at the conference. Fred Mazelis spoke for the Young Socialist Alliance, the only socialist youth organization that stands for independent political action. The YSA, he said, favors a united socialist ticket because "we feel that the struggles of the workers and the Negro people do not take place in the Democratic Party. The struggles take place in the mass movement and minority organizations. It is here that we must fight for a labor party."

Carol Lobman, another YSA speaker, said that the Democratic Party orientation proposed by Albertson would repulse new and young recruits to socialism. "They don't become socialists just by reading about it. They become socialists by defending socialist ideas, writing articles, speaking at forums and engaging in campaigns. The young people who come to us will have already rejected the Democrats and the Republicans. They will rebel against a directive to work in the Democratic Party. It will seem cynical to them."

This fresh approach, exhibited by young people new to the ideas of socialism, inspired a lot of "old timers" like Elinor Ferry who stressed the importance of young people in a live socialist movement.

The issue of "peaceful coexistence," injected by those influenced by the CP or Khrushchev's visit, continually cut across the question of what to do in 1960.

Morris Schappes, editor of Jewish Currents, stated that the main issue is peace. He contended that last year Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary of the SWP, said "he regarded peaceful coexistence as international class collaboration. I am glad that this has not been repeated here today."

Tom Kerry, speaking for the SWP, later quoted Dobbs more accurately, indicating the SWP position of opposing class collaboration and fighting for peace through class-struggle methods. Daniel Roberts, Associate Editor of the Militant, discussed the same point.

Morris Goldin, an Administrative Committee member, declared that in the interests of "peaceful coexistence" a presidential campaign in 1960 "would be a disservice." He even excluded the possibility of running Congressional candidates because "we don't have unity."

"What divides us," Goldin said, "is the fundamental shape of the world." There can be no electoral activity with "those who oppose peaceful coexistence. We must recognize that war is no longer inevitable."

Goldin's version of the meaning of "peaceful coexistence" was supported by fellow committee members Henry Abrams, Babbette Jones and Sidney Gluck. Gluck, who paid tribute to Khrushchev and Stalin, declared: "I don't care if there is a split over this question."

Joseph Hansen, Editor of the Militant, was the final speaker from the floor. He scored the way the question of "peaceful coexistence" had been injected into a discussion of what the 1958 campaign had accomplished and what socialists should do in 1960. "Supposing we agreed that peaceful coexistence was the main issue in the elections, would they then agree to run a campaign in 1960? They would not."

He argued that everyone present agreed on the usefulness of the Soviet Union's proposal for universal disarmament in showing up American imperialism. "But I for one will never agree to the disarmament of the American socialist movement."

Hansen pointed to the 1958 election platform of the Independent-Socialist ticket as proof that on specific issues involving peace, agreement had easily been reached.

From its theoretical position on Stalinism, he contended, it was impossible for the Socialist Workers Party to be opposed to peace. According to this theory "the cult of the individual and the decline of democracy in the Soviet Union were due to socialist defeats and the threat of invasion from the surrounding capitalist world.

"Victories of the Soviet Union, the SWP has maintained, would cause the decline of Stalinism and the restoration of democracy, proving that socialism and democracy are compatible. Consequently, in its defense of the USSR, the SWP has advocated policies to facilitate socialist victories and peace.

"That is another reason why the SWP is unalterably opposed to the disarmament of the American socialist movement."

Advertisement

Book-A-Month

Francis Bacon, Philosopher of Industrial Science, by Benjamin Farrington. This 202-page book was originally priced at $3.50. You get it for $1.25. For a description of this important book, see the review by William F. Warde in the Sept. 28 Militant.

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Subscription: $3 a year; Canadian, $3.50; foreign, $4.50. | THE MILITANT | Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN Associate Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY
Published weekly by the Militant Publishing Assn., 116 University Pl., N.Y. 3, N.Y. Phone: CH 3-2140.
Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. XXIII — No. 40 Monday, October 5, 1959

New China's Tenth Anniversary

On October 1, the People's Republic of China celebrates its tenth anniversary. Revolutionary socialists throughout the world celebrate the event with them. In this country, they are determined to work all the harder to win diplomatic recognition of the government that emerged from the momentous revolution of the Chinese masses ten years ago.

Nothing could be more perverted than Washington's continued recognition of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Taiwan as the "legitimate government of China." For the revolution was the product of the complete decay of Chiang's "nationalist" regime on the mainland. By 1949 it had become utterly discredited in the eyes of almost every Chinese person. Only the landlord class and the small coterie around Chiang that had been freely plundering the treasury backed him to the end.

Underlying the total collapse of the Chiang regime was an irrepressible peasant revolution. The peasants' determination to end landlordism and usury compelled the Communist Party leaders to combine agrarian overturn with the civil war that Chiang had forced on them. And the peasants forced the CP, which repeatedly sought a coalition government with Chiang, to carry through the struggle to the end when the dictator turned down the CP's offers.

With its accession to power, the Communist Party came to an unexpected crossroads. The Maoist program had called for China first to pass through a stage of capitalist development. This was held indispensable for industrialization and for the eventual transition to socialism.

But this schema was totally at variance with the reality the CP confronted. This dictated that China either take the Soviet path of nationalizing the means of production and developing them according to a plan or the country would sink back into the status of colonial dependency.

The Korean war — in which American imperialism demonstrated its implacable hatred for the revolution — forced the Mao regime to commit itself firmly to the Soviet path of development. Peking proceeded to expropriate all foreign holdings, and in 1953 launched the first five-year plan. As the plan drew to its conclusion, the nationalized industry completely overshadowed the remnant of private capital. In 1957-58, this remnant was abolished, with the former owners in many cases becoming factory managers and being integrated into the industrial bureaucracy.

During the first five years, too, the extremely small and unviable peasant holdings — the product of land division — were merged into cooperatives of increasingly larger size, and these in turn were pooled last year to form the rural people's communes.

The result of establishing socialist-type property forms in industry and agriculture have amazed the world. With Soviet aid, there has been rapid industrialization. China, the land of chronic famines for over a century, is now feeding and clothing its population, if still at an uncomfortably low level. Illiteracy is being wiped out. The country that was a hopeless dependency of imperialism, is rapidly rising toward the rank of one of the world's great powers.

To the other peoples of Asia and Africa that are now fighting for national independence, China points the way. India, under the rule of the capitalist class, cannot achieve the objectives that national independence was supposed to fulfill — namely, ending economic subjugation by Western capitalism and abolishing semi-feudal relations on the land. India's industrial rate of growth is much slower than China's. The archaic social relations in agriculture perpetuate the threat of famine. China alone of the economically underdeveloped countries is advancing on the road to fulfillment of the aspirations that have brought the masses throughout the colonial world onto the political arena.

Of course, the legacy of economic backwardness weighs heavily on China. It compels tremendous exertions from the Chinese people and imposes great privations on them. Economic backwardness has also given rise to a parasitic bureaucracy, whose interests the CP promotes, denying the workers and peasants their legitimate democratic rights. Nevertheless, China is definitely climbing out of the rut of Asiatic relations in which the country was still stuck in the twentieth century.

The Chinese revolution is but one overturn in an epoch in which the entire world is moving toward the socialist reorganization of society. The Chinese upheaval, added to the Russian Revolution of 1917 and its extension into Eastern Europe following World War II, speeds the disintegration of capitalist rule in the major industrial countries.

As the workers take power in the West and proceed to build socialism, they will extend unstinting aid to the Chinese working people. This will allow the Chinese masses speedily to complete the revolutionary rebuilding of their country begun so inspiringly ten years ago on October 1.



"Who do you suspect is the subversive agent that brain-washed God over to Khrushchev's side?"

Indian-Chinese Conflict Alarms Asian Socialists

The border dispute between India and China has deeply alarmed revolutionary socialists in Asia.

Articles and editorials in the Militant, organ of the revolutionary Workers Party of India, and the Samasamajist, voice of the Ceylonese Trotskyists, stress two essential features of the dispute.

(1) The Indian capitalist class utilizes the border conflict to impose reactionary measures on the masses.

(2) The Chinese border incursions turn Asian popular sentiment away from the People's Republic of China, and thus weaken revolutionary consciousness in Asia.

In the Sept. 8 Militant, Himoo Kalani writes: "Nehru's statement . . . that Chinese troops have 'crossed into' the 'Indian' territory and captured some checkposts there provided the signal for the reactionary forces to gird up their loins. Without caring to wait for the clarification of the issues involved, they have started stirring up the people's emotion for a crusade against this 'Chinese aggression.' Forgetting completely the recent history of bitter disputes between different sections of the Indian people themselves about the demarcation of the border line of various linguistic states, they have adopted the jingoistic attitude of 'My country, right or wrong.' All the cherished ideals of international friendship are being thrown to the four winds even before they are put to a serious test."

JINGOISM

Although scare propaganda is being whipped up to convince the Indian people that the Chinese have embarked on all-out war against India, says Kalani, "We do not believe that even our patriotic crusaders consider this to be feasible. The real inspiration of this sudden anti-Chinese, jingoistic movement has been betrayed by the West Bengal Congress which has unleashed a vile campaign to discredit the statewide food movement as an anti-national movement, an extension of the march of the Chinese troops into 'Indian' soil. In this manner, they want to confuse the masses and divert their attention from real problems of food, shelter, clothing, employment to an unreal issue and from their real enemies at home — the black-marketeers, hoarders, capitalists, to the assumed enemies abroad."

An editorial in the same issue of the Militant states:

"The bourgeois leaders and their press have exaggerated these [border] incidents out of proportion and are exploiting them to fan up jingoistic sentiments of the people to consolidate their regime as against the left movement. A virtual war hysteria has been created . . . We condemn this strategy of the capitalist Congress to undermine the unity of the exploited masses and their class struggles . . .

"While remaining vigilant in our task to prevent contamination of class struggle by the virus of jingoism, we must ask how far the border incursions by China, even with the plea that the frontiers between India and China are not properly demarcated, can be justified. We stand for the defense of the Workers State of China, although it is bureaucratically deformed, against imperialist intervention. But we cannot defend every action of the ruling bureaucracy in China . . .

"In the present border disputes, what is the justification for armed infiltration within traditionally accepted Indian territory? There need not be any sanctity of the so-called McMahon line drawn up by the British imperialists years ago to demarcate Tibet from their former Indian empire. But what is the scientific basis offered by the Chinese Stalinists for demarcating Tibet's boundaries with India and territories of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim? Just as they invoked a moth-eaten feudal treaty to annex Tibet for China, the Chinese Stalinists have invoked the maps drawn by the Chiang Kai-shek regime to claim large parts of the NEFA, Assam, Bhutan, Sikkim and Ladakh as Chinese territory without the least attempt to ascertain the wishes of the people inhabiting those regions.

"If bourgeois India is guilty of keeping the boundary lines vague (although Nehru has said that repeated attempts made from New Delhi for a settlement remained unresponded by Peking for over ten years), the Chinese Government is equally guilty of not taking the initiative to settle the dispute. A workers' state cannot have aggressive designs against any nation and its military tactics must always be subordinated to the needs of the world socialist movement. Apart from needlessly antagonizing an ally the Chinese Workers' State had in the Nehru Government, the border incidents if pursued can only help reactionary social forces against revolutionary forces in India, undermine the sympathy of the exploited masses and subject peoples of the world for workers' states and discredit the communist movement and communism itself."

In analyzing possible motives for Peking's border moves, the Militant editors state, "In their empirical blindness the Chinese Stalinists are quite capable of conceiving the possibility of building buffer zones around China by military bureaucratic means as a shortsighted defensive measure against the capitalist world.

"Whatever be the motive, the Chinese border incursions cannot be supported by revolutionary socialists in India. They must be condemned unreservedly because of the damage they cause to the revolutionary movement."

CEYLONESE VIEW

Writing in the Sept. 10 Samasamjist, Colvin R. de Silva, prominent spokesman of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, says: "The Sino-Indian border incidents, especially as they come on the morrow and in the context of the disturbing events in Tibet, help nobody except reaction. They certainly do no good to China. They damage Sino-Indian good relations, undermine the solidarity of the Indian masses with the Chinese revolution and serve to strengthen reactionary forces within India itself. On the Asian plane these events must deeply disturb the countries and even the friendly governments which border upon the Chinese People's Republic. In the international field generally the incidents have already become a weapon in the hands of World Imperialism in the cold war. They certainly place the international working class movement and the international revolutionary and progressive movements generally at a disadvantage in the defense of the Chinese revolution and its product the Chinese People's Republic, against World Imperialism . . .

"The Indian Government has consistently fought for the rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the field of international relations, including the CPR's right to be admitted to the UNO. The Indian Government has consistently refused to be stampeded by the cold war pressures of World Imperialism into embroilment with China.

"The capacity of the Chinese revolution to influence to the full the common people in other countries and especially in neighboring countries depends considerably upon the Chinese Government's capacity to maintain good relations with such of the newly independent non-revolutionary countries of Asia as strive to maintain friendly relations with the Chinese People's Republic. India certainly belongs to this category. To attempt to negotiate outstanding issues with India, patiently and with goodwill, is fundamental to the maintenance of good relations with her."

The American Way of Life

The Mighty Midget Disaster Kit

Since Khrushchev hit the United States with his universal disarmament proposal, some circles have thrown their hats in the air over the possibility of a new era of peace in which the most ferocious capitalist beasts will obligingly sheath their atomic claws, if not pull them out altogether.

However, one shrewd businessman, Carle W. Handel, seems to think that not much will come from the talk about "peaceful coexistence" and that America had best prepare for the worst. He suggests that everyone take out the necessary insurance; namely, the Mighty Midget Disaster Emergency Survival Kit. (In ordering for your children, please specify the Mighty Midget Disaster Emergency Survival Kit, Jr.)

As described in the New York Post, the kit is surprisingly compact — smaller than a woman's handbag — and very attractive to carry in its soft case of flamered, fallout-proof vinyl.

Mighty Midget contains a "fallout-proof mask, fallout-proof coat with hood, fallout-proof overshoes, fallout-proof water bag with water purification system. (One [1] halazone tablet per pint.) 24-hour ration bar, fallout-proof towel and soap. Kleenex case, map case."

The Sohio road map is one of the most useful items in the kit. Suppose, for example, that you know where a nuclear bomb landed. Suppose, in addition, that you know the wind's direction. Then you just superimpose an enclosed "fallout finder" on the road map and you'll know "when to start eating the 24-hour ration bar."

This is not ordinary milk chocolate. It's "tropical" chocolate. It won't melt until the temperature hits 130 degrees Fahrenheit.

The cost of the kit is a fantastically low $9.97, not counting the sales tax. (Unfortunately no reduction can be made for the children's size.)

After an H-bomb hits, you use Mighty Midget to get home. There you break out the "Family Size" kit which costs $38.75. (Packaged in attractive flamered, fallout-proof vinyl.)

This has "two of almost everything and food for two weeks along with a pliofilm tent to huddle under."

It's the two weeks period that's decisive. "One of the big problems is civilian morale," Handel notes. "And a big, full belly is one of the best things for civilian morale."

Here's what you do. Set up the pliofilm tent and wait until you're hungry. Then unwrap "Supper No. 1." This consists of "hot and cold consomme, fresh peach slices, beef and spaghetti, the piece de resistance; vanilla pudding, coffee, tea or hot chocolate, one quart milk, bread."

The food is certain to be edible, for it has been dehydrated. It is so dried out, in fact, that the powders will remain edible for five years.

Next morning you unwrap "Breakfast No. 1 with beverage powder — orange flavor, jiffy hot cereal, coffee or cocoa." And so you carry on in your pliofilm tent until you've downed "Supper No. 14."

What do you do after that?

"One of the state officials asked me that in Albany the other day," said Handel. "I told him, 'I speak Ojibway and I'll tell you a story. The state's evacuation plans call for use of the Adirondacks. There was a hard winter once in the Adirondacks and the Indians ate bark. 'Adirondack' in Ojibway means, 'Those who eat the bark of trees.'"

A platter of newly cut hickory, oak and pine bark would probably taste refreshing after "Supper No. 14," but how do you locate bark free from fallout?

Handel, a survival consultant for the U.S. Air Force and Navy, does not appear to be worried about that. It's enough for him that Leo A. Hoegh of the OCDM in Washington, after seeing the kit, said that "this is a type of item which the OCDM recommends that you have available in the event of a civil defense emergency."

— Paul Abbott

WITCH-HUNT VICTIMS

Marcus I. Goldman of Wash., D.C., 78-year-old Interior Department geologist and his wife Elizabeth refused to tell Senate investigators whether they were Communist Party members or if they had given money to "Communist causes." Goldman has been retired since 1949 after 42 years in government service, but that didn't save him from the witch-hunters.

. . . Cold War 'Armistice'

(Continued from Page 1)

volved, however, in the display of sweetness and light in international diplomacy. The Soviet Union genuinely needs peace, and Khrushchev's disarmament proposal was undoubtedly sincerely meant.

Walter Lippmann stressed this fact in his column of Sept. 24. The U.S. government, he said, "has for some considerable time realized the Soviet need for peace and Mr. K.'s intention to avoid war.

"In fact, the President would not have invited Mr. K. to come to Washington had he not been certain that the Soviet Union and Mr. K. want to avoid war, to avoid it not because they love us but because they themselves need years of peace in order to do what they have set themselves to do.

"This was the crucial point. It has injected an element of sincerity and credibility into Mr. K's persistent appeals for peace . . . The Soviet goals in the era over which Mr. K. presides cannot be achieved, indeed they would be utterly impossible, if there were war."

This is plain speaking from the well-known columnist, who is committed body and soul to capitalism.

It is beyond question that maintenance of the status quo ("peaceful coexistence") would favor the Soviet bloc, permitting these countries through the dynamism of their planned economies to move ahead at a faster rate than the still dominant capitalist sector of the world.

The difficulty with this goal, which was the goal in foreign policy of Stalin yesterday and Khrushchev today, is that it is continually upset by the major reality of our times, the struggle of world imperialism against the rise of the colonial peoples to independence and the irrepressible urge of the international working class to move in the direction of socialism.

The final victory of the working class and its allies would of course assure enduring peace. But this would signify the restoration of proletarian democracy in the Soviet Union and the liquidation of the bureaucracy. As the representative of that bureaucracy, Khrushchev, like Stalin, quite consciously seeks common ground with imperialism in maintaining the status quo against the revolutionary forces.

This is known to perfection among our imperialist rulers. They would prefer to smash the upcoming revolutionary forces, including their achievements in the Soviet Union, China and associated countries. But if they are unable to do this, they are prepared to take an alternative course: recognize the threatening forces and attempt to convert their leadership into docile, or at least semi-docile, agents.

Every militant will recognize the parallel in the trade union movement. When insurgent workers win recognition from a tough corporation through heroic battles on the picket lines, they subsequently see only too often that same corporation in collusion with trade-union leaders who have grown fat in the hips and the head.

Such considerations formed the basis for the pacts Stalin initialed to maintain the status quo — Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and so on.

The question today is, can the Kremlin deliver the goods the way it did during the thirties, for example, when it had powerful Communist Parties at its disposal throughout the areas affected by civil turmoil?

It would appear that the imperialist statesmen have been giving the possibilities some consideration. The Chicago Daily News in a Sept. 15 editorial put it like this:

"Whether Khrushchev planned it that way or not, the troubles in the Far East do in fact point up a reason why better relations with Russia, if soundly based, are desirable. They may be indispensable to prevent Red China from overrunning all of Eastern Asia. This would be a major catastrophe.

"It is probable that the ambitions of Red China's rulers are far more aggressive than Khrushchev desires. In the long run, they could be disturbing and even dangerous to the Soviet Union itself."

Cold-blooded calculation about the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy shows quite clearly through the thin cover of diplomatic language in this editorial.

Joseph C. Harsch, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, who often reflects rather closely the thinking in State Department circles, sees what the leadership of the Soviet bloc could do in mobilizing revolutionary sentiment and forces if it were of a mind to:

"But in the nonnuclear area of power, the Communists possess capacities for causing trouble which they are not currently exploiting, but which they could exploit all too easily and in too many directions for our present comfort."

He lists the Matsu-Quemoy area and Laos, then turns to more important places: "Communism is currently quiescent in much of Africa and the Middle East, but Africa is in a vast ferment, and the Arab states are far from having made their peace with the present shape of events."

Whether the "temporary armistice" in the cold war will lead to anything further remains to be seen. Since one of Eisenhower's objectives was simply to gain time, we will probably not see anything major one way or the other until during or after the 1960 elections.

That American imperialism will agree sincerely to substantial disarmament is excluded. Also excluded is the possibility that it will give up its drive toward another war, for this is inherent in the capitalist system, above all its strongest and most rapacious segment — American imperialism.

How accurate this conclusion is can be judged from the fact that on Sept. 28, the day Khrushchev flew back to Russia, the New York Times reported a new crisis over Iran and Sulzberger's comment from Istanbul: "If Iran collapses it will mean the end of the rump Baghdad Pact, a need to revise our own basic strategy and, perhaps, war."

Now We've Seen Everything

"When I watched the lovely stars of 20th Century Fox dance before the Premier and his family in Hollywood I could have thought, well, now I've seen everything.

"The performance had the quality of a midsummer's night fantasy, yet in many ways it was profound and meaningful drama." — Joseph North on Hollywood's reception to Khrushchev, Sept. 21 Daily Worker (London).

"It was immoral. Humanity's face is more beautiful than its backside. Only people who are oversatiated like such things and similar pornography." — Premier Khrushchev on Hollywood's reception, Sept. 21 Associated Press.

The Worker, published in New York, of which North is foreign editor, did not indicate the divergence of views on the esthetics of the Can-Can. Luckily, as a weekly publication, it was in better position than the British Communist Party daily to censor its correspondent's scandalous taste for the ribald.

Minorities and Delinquent Youth

Appearing before a Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency, New York Judge Samuel Leibowitz, in a despicable attack on Puerto Ricans and Negroes, urged that steps be taken to halt migration to New York City "from all parts of the country and the Caribbean" and that a law be passed requiring a year's residence before relief is granted those in need of it.

This loud-mouthed, headline-hunting jurist, whose courtroom denunciations of defendants as "punks," and whose threats to "throw the book" at them, strike tellingly at the fiction of an impartial bench, produced figures allegedly proving that Puerto Ricans and Negroes have a disproportionately high juvenile delinquency rate.

First, Leibowitz's statistics should not be accepted uncritically. They may be as tendentious or phony as he himself is. For example, Leibowitz says that while Puerto Ricans comprise less than 8% of the city's population, 22% of juvenile offenders are Puerto Rican. But this leaves out of account the youthfulness of the Puerto Rican population. (Most of the old folks are left at home when families migrate to New York.) Though only 15% of Manhattan's population, Puerto Ricans comprise 33% of Manhattan's school children — and less than 30% of Manhattan's juvenile delinquency cases.

Regardless of the figures, there is a direct correlation between sweat-shop wages, slums, discrimination, and the prevalence of crime and juvenile delinquency. The latter are produced by the former and not by any characteristics or qualities of the racial or nationality groups subjected to them. Let's not forget that back in the 1920's anti-Catholic bigots had statistics to show that even in states where Catholics were a minority, the prison population was in its majority, or in disproportionately large part, Catholic. This was supposed to prove that, compared with Protestantism, the Catholic religion was so "immoral" that it bred criminals.

The point was then, as it is now with regard to Negroes and Puerto Ricans, that poverty and slums drive larger numbers of the people subjected to them to crime and juvenile delinquency than do the less evil conditions of better wages and better housing.

The miserable slum dwellings for which Negro and Puerto Rican families in New York have to pay ghetto landlords fantastically high rents are too well known to require repetition here. What may not be so well known is that New York is a sweatshop city. In a list of 20 U.S. cities with more than 100,000 factory workers (including five deep South cities) New York ranked next to last in average weekly wages.

Tens of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican heads of families earn between $40 and $50 a week. Yet, according to the Community Council of Greater New York, a typical family of four required in October 1958 a minimum weekly income of $91 to maintain "an adequate but modest level of living."

THE MILITANT

VOLUME XXIII — MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1959 — NUMBER 40

Letters from Our Readers

Can Socialists Vote For "Lesser Evil" In Case Like This?

Editor:

The prime objective of socialists should be to get socialist candidates on the ballot in as many places as possible—including the Presidential race. But failing this, I see no reason why they shouldn't vote for, without actively supporting, liberal capitalist candidates as against outright reactionaries. This, certainly, would be no dissipation of valuable socialist energy but the recognition that whatever social gains can be achieved under capitalism should be supported by socialists as stepping stones to socialism.

I realize that the present political climate is making it more difficult to put the above in practice. How do you determine just who is the lesser of two evils? For instance when one speaks of supporting Adlai Stevenson against any Republican candidate, one intends thereby to support the candidate of the liberal-capitalist party whose ex-President refused even to sit down opposite Khrushchev against the conservative-capitalist party whose President invited Khrushchev to this country.

Socialists who support Democrats, **per se**, have forgotten that the lackeys of capitalism are often more virulent in their anti-communism, more vicious in their practice of it, than their capitalist masters. They have to be. Their position is insecure. One false step and they are accused of "twenty years of treason." Hence the picture of labor leaders—with the FBI over their shoulders—insulting their Soviet guest while a leading capitalist—with the FBI in his pocket—graciously shows him around his factory.

Dana Platt
South Gate, Calif.

Air-Raid Tribute To White Sox Panics Chicagoans

Editor:

The hysteria of the cold war dramatically struck home in Chicago on Tuesday night, Sept. 22, when thousands panicked at the sound of air-raid sirens blaring across this Midwest metropolis.

Doctors rushed to local hospitals, parents carried their children to cellars, and others just shrunk in fear as the sirens wailed their eerie cry.

To the consternation of civil defense authorities and the mass of Chicago citizens, it was found that an overjubilant White Sox fan — a Chicago political hack—had set off the air raid alarms to help celebrate the American League pennant victory of the Chicago baseball team.

All of the officials from Mayor Daley on down tried to shift the blame onto the public, saying that they would have known there was no air raid if they had turned on their radios as Civil Defense has always instructed.

Chicagoans have not swallowed this, however. The indignation expressed all over the city shows how fed up the public is with the cold war and the jitters it has created.

J. T.
Chicago

They Sure Looked Ridiculous Arguing With Khrushchev

Editor:

I was amused at the American labor leaders defending capitalism against Khrushchev while the full force of the government is being brought to the fore to break the unions.

Only action by the rank and file can save the unions from disastrous defeat. The honeymoon between Labor and Capital is over. One or the other will go down.

Hope you can continue your high standards of a good paper.

S. P.
Milwaukee

Steelworker Finds He Is on Blacklist

Editor:

If there is anything that enrages me, it is making light of the plight of the working man. One writer to the reader's column in the boss press said that striking Steelworkers could get another job or go on vacation, but the little businessman really suffers.

A locked-out Steelworker I know gave me the real lowdown from his actual experiences. For the past two weeks he has been looking for work. Nobody wants to run in the hole. Since he's highly skilled, with over 25 years as a machinist, it should have been a cinch.

Of the nine shops that needed help, six told him in so many words that it was "company policy" not to hire striking Steelworkers. These shops pay wages that make it possible to support a family with two children. One that pays $3.56 an hour to a first-class machinist spent three hours interviewing him. They were enthusiastic. Just the man they needed. But it's too bad he worked in steel. In vain he argued. They were adamant. Return to work in steel after the strike, then come back and he can have the job.

After that he decided to play it cool. He said nothing about steel in his next application. But checking one of his references, the company found out that he had gone to work at steel.

When asked why he had not mentioned steel, he asked his interviewer if they would have hired him if he had done so. The interviewer said, "No."

"Well then?" he asked.

"We have nothing to say," the interviewer answered and concluded the interview.

E. S.
Chicago

Do Texas Baptists Pray for an End To H-Bomb Tests?

Editor:

I noticed with great interest the letter from Mrs. T. L. of Texas. What brazen hypocrisy on the part of the Texas Baptists to petition heaven to "make Mr. K. a Christian!" I wonder if they ever pray to heaven to save the world from Wall Street's H-Bomb tests! Somehow, I doubt it.

My father used to say that when our ruling class (or its supporters) invoked religion, it reminded him of the Byzantine emperors, who managed to find the time — between barbaric atrocities—to say a few kind words about God, and most likely thought that God should be extremely grateful for the attention!

However, long before its Byzantine degeneration, the Christian movement was certainly a most heroic atempt to build a better world; it cannot be denied that the early Christians sacrificed themselves without hesitation for the sake of their fellow men. One does not have to agree with their methods to realize that their aim in life was a true brotherhood of man—a decent society of which no one would need to be ashamed. I do not think that they should be forgotten or belittled even after two thousand years.

I don't agree with Mrs. T. L. that Christians are no more peaceable than average men, but the question is, where are the Christians? Where can you find any, except for a few individuals and a few sects, such as one I heard about in the Soviet Union which seems to be striving for Christian communism? Where, indeed, are the Christians?

Still, I think it's remarkable that there are even a handful of them in the modern world, after so many centuries of the opposite way of life. I feel we should respect them, even when we cannot agree with them.

Belle Montague
Cambridge, Mass.

Notes in the News

HOW TO MILK A WHISKEY BOTTLE — When a Pennsylvania resident buys a fifth of whiskey for $4.16 in a state liquor store, $1.71 goes to the state in profits and taxes, the federal government gets $1.85 in taxes and the shipper gets three cents. The original distiller's price is 57 cents.

* * *

BROUGHT TV LEVEL UP TOO HIGH — Ben Hecht, the author-playwright, offered this explanation for his brief-lived career on television: "I was getting more mail than anybody, including Pat Boone. But the station executives said it was the wrong kind of mail. It was too literate. 'These are not the kind of people who buy things advertised on TV,' they told me. It seems that the paper must have lines on it and words must be misspelled."

* * *

A CORRECTION—Last issue we reported the Atomic Energy Commission's statement that strontium 90 fallout from nuclear tests had been on the decline since last spring. What the commission didn't report, and what we didn't know at the time, is that the areas in which the strontium level declined are also areas that had substantially less rain and snow. Much of the fallout is brought down with precipitation. Authorities on the question believe that the strontium fallout will continue to increase until the late 1960's or early 1970's even if the tests are not resumed.

* * *

A CASE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY?—When two men burglarized a Brooklyn household the family dog watched and wagged his tail cheerfully. But when a pair of detectives showed up to investigate he bared his teeth and bit them on the legs and ankles.

* * *

OBSTACLE FOR AMERICAN ASTRONAUTS — The London Daily Express reported an alleged short interview with an unidentified official of the U.S. State Department as follows: **Question:** How long will it take to get a man to the moon? **Answer:** Five days. One day to get him there, four days to get him through Russian customs.

* * *

HOW TO BUST A STRIKE — In an article entitled, "The Anatomy of a Strike," Dun's Review tells employers how to "shape" strike strategy. Its advice includes: "Remember a strike is an industrial war" and "Don't assume that a strike will be short-lived." It lists three ways for the employer to "win." These include the "strategy of the summit settlement," the "strategy of over-the-head of the union to the worker," and the "strategy of the power play" in which the company deliberately keeps the plant open.

* * *

URGE END TO WITCH-HUNT COMMITTEE — The Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms has again urged Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to place before Congress the question of abolishing the Un-American Activities Committee. Dorothy Marshall, Chairman of the Los Angeles organization, points out that the witch-hunting committee is trying to oust 110 California school teachers on the basis of so-called "confidential committee findings." This is cited as further proof that the House committee does not exercise a legitimate legislative function but attempts "to act as judge, jury and hangman" of private individuals whose views it does not like.

* * *

INCREASE IN "MOONLIGHTING" — The U.S. Department of Labor lists as one of "the significant phenomena of the postwar labor market history in the United States" the increase in the number of workers engaging in "moonlighting"—holding down two or more jobs. About one in twenty American workers is a "moonlighter." "Multiple jobholding was found to be much more prevalent among men than women, among married men than single men, and among single women than married women." The Department does not explain why workers engage in "moonlighting," but the explanation is simple. Wages on a single job are not sufficient to support a family in an increasing number of cases because of mounting inflation since the end of World War II.

* * *

COSTLY ARMS RACE — In a speech a year ago before the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Gen. Hugh B. Hester, retired, gave the following graphic description of the cost of the arms race: "Since World War II we have spent approximately $500 billion for security. And I might add that in the opinion of the people with whom I talk in Washington and around the country, the United States today, after that expenditure, has less security than at any other time in her history. It has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar that you are paid by 50%. The great powers alone are spending over $100 billion annually. It is probably close to $120 billion, and that is estimated to be more than the annual income of two-thirds of the human race.

UE Debates Labor Party Resolution

By Howard Mayhew

CHICAGO — Political action was a key issue at the convention of the independent United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, Sept. 21-24.

Local 107, embracing 6,000 workers at the Lester, Pa., Westinghouse plant, had submitted a resolution calling upon the convention to "go on record endorsing the running of independent labor candidates wherever feasible" and the "development of a labor party."

Although many delegates during the discussion sharply criticized both the Republican and Democratic parties, the UE convention did not adopt Local 107's stand.

The resolution on political action that was passed stated that "Labor's path must be independent, based on Labor's policies and not bound by the compromises and intrigues of the machine bosses of either the Democratic or Republican parties. This will lead toward our goal of a political party of labor and its allies." However, the convention resolution presented no alternative for 1960 to the policy of electing "friends of labor" within the framework of the two-party system.

Frank Bradley and Robert Kyler, business agent and president of Local 107, elaborated the viewpoint of their local on political action in a discussion with this reporter. They reject the idea that it is possible or desirable for labor to capture the Democratic Party. "It is now time for labor to organize a second party," is the way they put it. By this they mean that they view the Democrats and Republicans to be merely two parts of one big-business-controlled political machine.

UE'S GAINS

Instead of a "non-partisan" approach to politics, such as the official UE resolution calls for, Bradley and Kyler want a labor party that is as partisan for labor on the political front as they want the unions to be on the economic front.

UE is staging a definite comeback. This is what figures released by Charles Allen, the union's publicity director reveals.

In the past 14 months, UE gained 10,000 new members and won improvements in existing contracts thanks to increased militancy and solidarity in the ranks.

Since the last convention UE engaged in 39 Labor Board elections, winning 25, or 64%. In the same period, the International Union of Electrical Workers (AFL-CIO) won 40% and the International Association of Machinists (AFL-CIO) won 51% of the elections they engaged in. These two unions are the UE's principal rivals.

How big a toll the fratricidal struggle has taken in the electrical industry since the top CIO leaders drove out the UE on the "Communism" issue and set up the IUE was described by one delegate. "In 1950 in Westinghouse there was one union, today there are 35. In GE today the company deals with 93 different unions."

Speaking on the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin law, Frank Donner, UE general counsel, made the following analogy. Each section of the anti-labor bill is presented as an aid to American workers, yet when you see it as a whole it reminds you of the collection of parts brought out of a German "baby-carriage" plant under Hitler. A young, poorly paid husband, working in the plant, had promised his wife a baby-carriage explaining that he would carry out one part each day then assemble it himself. When he got all the parts and assembled them, however, he was disappointed. "No matter how many times I put the parts together," he told his wife, "it always turns out to be the same thing—a machine gun."

The report from Canada by George Sullivan stressed that the labor movement there also faces an anti-labor drive. Sullivan reported that the Canadian UE is "four square . . . for the formation of a new party . . . based upon the labor movement." Sullivan also told of wage gains at London Westinghouse of 34 cents an hour for two years for women workers and 27 cents for men.

Will Renew Plea





Helen Sobell, wife of frame-up victim Morton Sobell, will repeat her request to U.S. prison authorities that she be allowed to stay in Atlanta federal penitentiary with her husband long enough to conceive a child. "My husband has been in prison for ten years and the time in which we can have children is coming to an end," she said. "We don't want to lose our future as we have lost our present."

James V. Bennett, U.S. Prison director, refused Mrs. Sobell's first request last April. Sobell, now 42, was given a 30-year sentence in a hysteria-surrounded, frame-up trial along with the Rosenbergs, who were executed. Mexico, other Latin American and many European countries, have a humane penal policy permitting such extended visits by prisoners' spouses.

. . . Sweep Issues Under Rug

(Continued from Page 1)

In a historic period that demands unified class action on the economic and political front, the structural deficiency of the AFL-CIO stands out as a glaring anachronism. This corresponds to the "business unionism" thinking of most of the large internationals. On the other hand, those sections of the AFL-CIO leadership representing mass production industry, who seek to play a larger social and political role, find themselves constantly in conflict with the strict limitations of the federation.

This has given rise to many battles in the inner councils of the AFL-CIO. It is the root cause of the antagonism between Meany and Reuther.

POLITICAL PROBLEM

The number one problem facing the convention was the political one. This is now taken for granted even by the most "anti-political" elements of the labor movement. Great hope had been placed in the activities of COPE, the political arm of the AFL-CIO. And it seemed that its efforts were meeting with brilliant success after the 1958 elections. Now ten months later the bitter joke was—"another victory like that and we're dead."

A number of resolutions on political action were submitted to the resolutions committee. Most of these called for the strengthening of COPE and more strenuous efforts to replace reactionary congressmen.

One resolution, however, stood out, that of Soderstrom representing the Illinois Federation of Labor. It was a serious resolution not meant as a resolution for the record. It could best be described as a transitional proposal from the present policy of COPE to the formation of a labor party. Its final resolve called for taking that course.

The resolutions committee took this resolution and all the others, reduced them to a puree comprising what it called the substance of them all. Their proposed resolution made no real departure from the old and fatal course. The main change was its formal rejection of any party ties. This could give advocates of independent labor candidates a hole through which they can drive.

The debate that followed on the floor was one of the high points of the convention. Mike Quill, president of the Transport Workers advocated the idea of forming a labor party. Privately many of the delegates agreed with Quill but were reluctant to challenge the course set by the top brass of the convention. The official resolution was adopted unanimously, and once again the American labor movement was advised to follow hat in hand the capitalist politicians who wear the label of "friend of labor."

JIM-CROW UNIONS

The conservative and reactionary thinking in the top circles of this movement received another jolt in a forceful challenge from A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters. Randolph took the floor several times to demand equal rights for Negro members within the federation.

The first dramatic encounter took place when the resolution on the readmission of the International Longshoremen's Association came up. Randolph challenged the recommendation on the grounds that the ILA was guilty of race discrimination. He cited a recently issued report of the NAACP and the Urban League giving facts and figures about race discrimination on the New York waterfront.

Meany, Joe Curran of the National Maritime Union and Paul Hall of the Seafarers, answered Randolph. They asserted that there was no discrimination and if there was it was the fault of the State Water front Commission. Meany further attacked Randolph for listening to "outside organizations" and not "staying with the team."

This was only a prelude to a more heated fight which took place when Randolph's resolution came up to expel two Railroad Brotherhoods for discrimination. He told a graphic story of how the railway trainmen and railway firemen act in collusion with rail management to exclude Negroes from certain jobs.

For example, on the rail lines of the southeast conference, Negroes once made up 80% of the railroad firemen when the work was tough and dirty. When the roads went over to diesel operation these Negro firemen were displaced by white firemen and now comprise only 10% of the craft.

And even this remaining small minority is barred from promotion to the next step which is locomotive engineer. Negro firemen with many years seniority suffer the humiliation of seeing white firemen many years their junior step up into the top job of locomotive engineer. All this is done through the "white only" clauses of the Railroad Brotherhoods involved.

Randolph made a stirring appeal for these workers and he was ably backed up by several other Negro delegates. **Not a single white delegate joined this fight.** Not even a murmur of protest against President Walsh of the Theatrical workers who told a typical "razor slashing" story of "two Negro brothers."

George Meany was infuriated by Randolph's fight. At one point he shouted at Randolph, "who the hell appointed you to speak for the Negroes?" He himself spoke angrily for the "democratic rights" of Negro members to belong to jim-crow locals of various International unions.

The former CIO progressives kept quiet during this fight led by Randolph. This is probably a reflection of their anxiety not to "rock the boat." The AFL-CIO merger is an uneasy one, and the conflict between the industrial unions and the craft unions goes on as it always has. There are, according to some delegates, more jurisdictional conflicts between these two sections now than there were before the merger.

This is recognized as the major internal problem facing the AFL-CIO. Reuther and Carey are pressing for a constitutional change that would permit the AFL-CIO more authority to settle all jurisdictional conflicts. A resolution was adopted calling for a special constitutional convention to meet in 1960 to achieve that end. Each section of the AFL-CIO interprets this resolution as a promise of final action in its own interest.

WALKOUTS INCREASE

There were 2,400 strikes in the 12 months ending July 31, as against 2,087 in the previous year. There were 1.5 million workers involved in the 1958-59 strikes, nearly double the number for 1957-58.

Milwaukee Cops Scored for Role In Negro Areas

MILWAUKEE, Sept. 27 — At a meeting last night sponsored by the Crusaders Civil & Social League, two guest speakers took opposite sides on the role of the police and what to do about them. The meeting was sparked by the growing indignation in the Negro community over police harassment and intimidation.

Invitations to attend the meeting, which was held at the New Hope Baptist Church, had been sent to both Mayor Zeidler and Police Chief Johnson, but neither showed up.

The two guest speakers were George H. Bingham, a Milwaukee attorney, and Clifton DeBerry, Chicago trade unionist and chairman of the Committee to Combat Racial Injustice.

Bingham discussed "Due Process of Law." He stated that laws are on the books designed to protect people from harassment and intimidation. Pointed questions came from the audience regarding the hostile attitude and actions of the police toward Negro citizens.

Bingham held that most policemen are good and try to enforce the laws on the books, but a few bad policemen do exist and they are the ones making trouble. He praised the department for solving a local murder case involving a Negro mental patient and urged the Negro community to get its own representatives on the commissions Mayor Zeidler has set up to study city problems.

The audience reacted sharply to Bingham's praise of the police. They cited numerous instances showing how far his favorable picture varied from the facts.

DeBerry discussed "For Integration in Housing and Employment." He said that he did not agree with the view that policemen can be divided into the good cops and the bad cops. The task of the police department is to carry out the policies of the city administration. If these policies are bad, then the city suffers.

"Politics is bread and butter," he declared, "for politics determines our lives. What we need to do is organize our community — form block clubs, tenant groups, unite the fight in the shop with the fight in the community. Get your union to take a stand on community problems, for they affect your union."

DeBerry called for no support to machine-selected candidates. He pointed to the need for labor and the Negro community to form their own political organization and select their own candidates.

PROGRESS IN BOYCOTT

The Crusaders Civic & Social League reported progress in the boycott the group has been conducting against the Tompkins Ice Cream Co. The outfit has refused to hire Negro workers despite the fact that over 90% of their business is within the Negro community.

Tompkins secured an injunction against the Crusaders to stop the boycott, but the Crusaders are fighting the injunction and have carried the fight to court. A hearing is scheduled Sept. 30.

The Crusaders urged everyone present to attend the court hearing. The audience was also asked to bring their friends to help demonstrate the solidarity of the community in its fight against the arrogant Jim Crow attitude of the company.

. . . Detroit Cops

(Continued from Page 1)

only patrolmen kicking and slugging at him . . ."

Police Commissioner Hart quickly denied any wrongdoing on the part of his officers and Prosecutor Olsen issued warrants against the teenagers, charging them with resisting arrest and conspiracy to assault. Leading Detroit newspapers backed the police, labelling the youth "hoodlums" and calling on responsible leaders of the Negro community to combat "criminal elements" who discredit all colored persons.

The Negro press, however, has dug up fresh facts. When one youth, for instance, broke from the cops and ran into his home, shouting, "Mama, come and help me!" the police followed.

"They came storming into my house," said the boy's mother, "and I said you can't come in here without warrants and one of 'em said, warrants, hell, we ought to kill all you niggers."

Another of the youths said that the police "made us boys say my brother Melvin hit one of the officers with a chair. And they told us they would kill us if we didn't say it was Steel who hit one of them with a bat."

The NAACP and the defense attorney report that they have received phone calls offering finincial aid. Support to the young boys has been offered by the Trade Union Leadership Council, a body of leading Negro trade unionists in this area, and by the Urban League, the Wolverine Bar Association, the Hi-D Club of Highland Park and the Detroit branch of the NAACP.

The Committee on Political Education (COPE) in the thirteenth and fifteenth districts sent resolutions to the police commissioner and the Mayor's Committee on Civil Rights condemning police brutality.

TEENAGE PETITION

A group of teenagers called "The Rebels" is circulating a petition in Detroit high schools demanding that the charges against the youths be dropped. "If there is to be any prosecution, it should be against the cops. Even if the kids were guilty of some crime, it wasn't up to the cops to carry out punishment. This is supposed to be the job of the courts."

"What guarantee is there," asks the petition, "that any teenager is safe from this kind of 'protection' from the law? This is really a great philosophy: 'Beat juvenile delinquency . . . by beating juveniles!' "

Why not pass this copy of the Militant on to a friend?

Calendar Of Events

NEW YORK

"The New AFL-CIO Line on Political Action." An analysis by **Tom Kerry**, New York Chairman, Socialist Workers Party. **Friday, Oct. 9, 8 p.m.** Contrib. 50 cents. **Militant Labor Forum**, 116 University Place.

Local Directory

BOSTON
Boston Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Room 200.

CHICAGO
Socialist Workers Party, 777 W. Adams, DE 2-9736.

CLEVELAND
Socialist Workers Party 10609 Superior Ave., Room 301, SW 1-1818. Open Wednesday nights 7 to 9.
The Militant, P.O. Box 1904, University Center Station, Cleveland 6, Ohio.

DETROIT
Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward. TEmple 1-6135.

LOS ANGELES
Forum Hall and Modern Book Shop, 1702 E. 4th St. AN 9-4953 or WE 5-9238.

MILWAUKEE
150 East Juneau Ave.

MINNEAPOLIS
Socialist Workers Party, 322 Hennepin Ave., 2nd floor. Open noon to 6 P.M. daily except Sundays.

NEWARK
Newark Labor Forum, Box 361, Newark, N. J.

NEW YORK CITY
Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place, AL 5-7852.

OAKLAND - BERKELEY
P.O. Box 341, Berkeley 1, Calif.

PHILADELPHIA
Militant Labor Forum and Socialist Workers Party, 1303 W. Girard Ave. Lectures and discussions every Saturday, 8 P.M., followed by open house. Call PO 3-5820.

SAN FRANCISCO
The Militant, 1145 Polk St., Rm. 4. Sat. 11 A.M. to 3 P.M. Phone PR 6-7296; if no answer, VA 4-2321.

SEATTLE
1412—18th Avenue, EA 2-5554. Library, bookstore.

ST. LOUIS
For information phone MO 4-7194.